

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Final Action of March 23, 2010 in which pending claims 31-44 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mathiassen et al* (U.S. Patent No. 7,251,351) in view of *Berberich* (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,457).

Regarding the statement by the Examiner that *Berberich* teaches “wherein said substrate and said sensor part are galvanically separated,” pointing to *Berberich* at Figs. 1 and 4 and column 1, lines 35-57 and column 3, lines 51-60 and column 4, lines 40-43, it has to be pointed out that the resistance sensor 1 of Fig. 4 of *Berberich* is on the outer side 24 of the windshield glass and the only thing that is on the opposite sides of the windshield glass are the primary winding 16 and the secondary winding 17. In that case, the substrate and the sensor part are not galvanically separated since the resistance sensor 1 is totally on the surface of the glass.

The further statement by the Examiner that “wherein said substrate and said sensor part comprise means for transferring energy and measurement information inductively between said substrate and said sensor part” is also incorrect. The energy transfer is between the primary winding 16 and the secondary winding 17, not between the substrate and the sensor part.

Therefore, the teachings of *Berberich* when combined with the disclosure of *Mathiassen et al* would not result in the claimed feature wherein the substrate and the sensor part are galvanically separated, and wherein said substrate and said sensor part comprise means for transferring energy and measurement information inductively between said substrate and said sensor part.

Regarding the Examiner’s response to arguments in Section 8 beginning on page 10 of the detailed final action, it also has to be pointed out that the Examiner has not explained exactly how the teachings of *Berberich* would be used in a structural sense to arrive at that which is claimed in claim 31. It is not clear how the sensor elements 3, for instance, of Fig. 1 of *Mathiassen et al* would be modified in the sense shown by *Berberich* to arrive at the subject matter claimed in claim 31 or why this would be done. It seems to applicants that the placing of the sensor elements 3 at a raised level at the surface (at the same level as the outer metal layer 10) would create

problems that *Mathiassen et al* already avoided by putting the imaging sensor elements 3 at an interior layer level on top of the ceramic substrate 2 with the protective first dielectric layer 7 and the second dielectric layer 9 deposited on top so as to provide the desired protection pointed out by the Examiner. It seems to the applicants that the course of action suggested by the Examiner would go against this philosophy taught by *Mathiassen et al* and likewise goes against the motivations suggested by the Examiner.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the final rejection and withdraw same so that the claims as presently pending may proceed to allowance.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of March 23, 2010, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 31-44 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234